



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/695,917	10/26/2000	Mamoru Miyashita	905-0248P	2868

2292 7590 06/30/2003

BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

[REDACTED] EXAMINER

NGUYEN, CHANH DUY

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2675	7

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/695,917	MIYASHITA, MAMORU
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Chanh Nguyen	2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 April 2003.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1 and 3-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ . |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Remarks

1. The Remarks filed on April 11, 2003 has been entered and considered by examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1, 4, 5-7 and 10-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,748,237) in view of Hibino et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,751,343) and Hattori et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,739,859)

As to claim 1, Ueda discloses a liquid crystal display device having a case (1) internally accommodating a liquid crystal display panel (2) which display an image represented by an applied image signal, , the case (1) being performed to include a freely openable and closable light admission window (6) for admitting outside light (see column 2, lines 65-67), and a light guide path (9) being formed for introducing the outside light, which has been admitted by opening the light admission window (6) to the back side of the liquid crystal display panel (2); see figure 1.

Ueda teaches a liquid crystal display device including a backlight device (5) for projecting backlight toward the back side of the liquid crystal display panel (2), a setting unit (8) for setting to admit outside light from the light admission window or to

Art Unit: 2675

project backlight from the backlighting device (5) (see column 3, lines 25-32), a signal correction circuit and a backlight control circuit (24-27) for subjecting the applied image signal to a correction for outdoor display in response to a setting by the setting unit (8) for admission of the outside light and from turning on the backlight device in response to a setting by setting unit for projection of the backlight, respectively (see column 4, line 25 through column 5, line 21).

The only difference from the reference of Ueda and the claim 1 only in that Ueda only mention adjusting white balance for correcting a color video signal (column 4, line 32-37) whereas claim 1 recites "correction selected from the group consisting of a gamma correction, luminance correction, contour correction, hue correction, and color saturation correction". In same field of endeavor, Hibino teaches that "a processing circuit 203 has image correcting functions, such as white balance, luminance correction, contour correction, and color correction,..." (see column 4, lines 10-15). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have substituted the luminance correction circuit or contour correction circuit as taught by Hibino to the color correction of Ueda so that the brightness or contour portion of the image can be corrected (see column 4, line 64 through column 5, line 5), thereby the image can be viewed with proper colors.

Ueda teaches the liquid crystal display screen (2) disposed inside the case (1) whereas claim 1 recite a display screen exposed externally of the case. Hibino does not mention the position of the display screen. Hattori teaches a well-known a liquid crystal display screen (15) exposed externally of the case (13). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used the expose display panel of Hattori to the display panel of Ueda as modified by Hibino so as to allow a number of people to view the image simultaneously as well as to avoid a number of drawbacks for the small eyepiece type viewfinder such as missing the subject because the operator is unaware of his or her surrounding or the camera could not be physically moved fast enough to catch up with a fast moving object or the like.

As to claim 4, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that claim 4 is method claim whereas claim 1 is apparatus. This method claim 4 is analyzed as previously discussed with respect to apparatus claim 1 above.

As to claim 5, Hibino clearly teaches gamma correction (γ correction); see column 6, lines 56-61.

As to claim 6, Hibino clearly teaches luminance correction; see column 4, lines 10-15.

As to claim 7, Hibino clearly teaches contour correction; see column 4, lines 10-15.

As to claims 10-12, these claims recites the same limitation as claims 5-7. Thus, they are analyzed with respect to claims 5-7 above.

3. Claims 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Hibino and Hattori as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Etoh (U.S. Patent No. 5,729,289).

As to claim 3, note the discussion of Ueda, Hibino and Hattori above, Ueda teaches an output circuit, but does not mention it can removably attaches to the liquid crystal display device. Etoh teaches the circuitry disposed on the case (1A) can removably attaches to the liquid crystal display (1B); see column 3, lines 32-37. . Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used removable image pick-device having output circuit from the display panel to the video camera of Ueda as modified by Hibino and Hattori so that device can be arranged in the carry bag easily.

4. Claims 8-9 and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ueda in view of Hibino and Hattori as applied to claims 1 and 4 above, and further in view of Kawada et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,179,437) or Konishi et al (5,461,429).

As to claims 8-9 and 13-14, note the discussion of Ueda, Hibino and Hattori above, Ueda teaches white balance correction, and Hibino further teaches luminance correction, contour correction, gamma correction, but does not mention hue and saturation corrections. In same field of endeavor, Kawada teaches hue correction as well as saturation correction is automatically conducted ; see column 1, lines 16-18. Similar to the Kawada, Konishi teaches color hue and color saturation can be controlled besides making the accurate white balance correction; see column 6, lines 12-17. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the invention was made to have used the hue and color saturation correction circuit as taught by Kawada or

Konishi to the color correction of Ueda so as to provide high saturation level and hue level to the displayed color image, thereby the image can be viewed with proper colors.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed April 11, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

As to Claim Rejections- 35 U.S.C 103-Ueda et al/Hibino et al/ Hattori et al, on page 2, line 17 through page 3, line 8, applicant argues that while Ueda corrects the color of the displayed image in response to the external light and the light from the back light, Ueda et al. fails to subject the applied image to a correction for outdoor display.

However, examiner would like to present his point of views as follows:

First of all, Applicant never argued the significant of claimed "outdoor display". For example, on October 30, 2002, applicant simply argues about the signal correction circuit which relates to the limitation a gamma correction, luminance correction, contour correction etc. Nothing in the Remark of October 30, 2002 is mentioned about the "outdoor display" or the combination of Ueda and Hattori with the limitation of the "outdoor display". It is noted that examiner used both references of Ueda and Hattori for both previous rejections. Thus, it is clear that the limitation "outdoor display" is met by Ueda as set forth in the previous office action.

Secondly, the claimed "outdoor display" is so broad that it reads on the liquid crystal display (2) of Ueda included in the viewfinder (1) or video camera being used outdoor environment. The viewfinder (1) including the liquid crystal display (2) should be used both indoor and outdoor. For example, column 1, lines 22-23 of Ueda teaches

that "the cameraman uses a video camera outdoors under strong sun light". Thus, the liquid crystal display (2) of Ueda can be used both outdoor and indoor depending on where is the cameraman. This is interpreted as "outdoor display" as broad claimed language. If the video camera is used outdoors, then the liquid crystal display (2) is used outdoor too because it (LCD 2) is included in the video camera . Furthermore, nowhere in Ueda suggests that the video camera including the liquid crystal display (2) uses only indoor.

On page 3, last paragraph, applicant argues that there is no outdoor light the would affect the LCD display of Ueda because in viewing the LCD of Ueda, the user must look through eyepieces 3 through viewfinder barrel 1. Examiner disagrees with applicant this point of view since Ueda recognizes the problem of the use of a video camera outdoor under strong sun light would affect LCD (see column 1, lines 25-27). Ueda provides the color correction to correct the color under any environment (see column 2, lines 16-21).

Conclusion

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

Art Unit: 2675

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 308-6603.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner supervisor, Steven Saras can be reached at 305-9720.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121
Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist)

Art Unit: 2675

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

CN
C.Nguyen
June 24, 2003


CHANH NGUYEN
PRIMARY EXAMINER